

Belvedere:
Jerry Butler

Corte Madera:
Melissa Gill

Fairfax:
Lew Tremaine

Larkspur:
Joan Lundstrom

Mill Valley:
Dick Swanson

Novato:
Pat Eklund

Ross:
Tom Byrnes

San Anselmo:
Peter Breen

San Rafael:
Al Boro

Sausalito:
Amy Belser

Tiburon:
Alice Fredericks

County of Marin:
Susan Adams
Hal Brown
Steve Kinsey
Cynthia Murray
Annette Rose

MINUTES

MARIN TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE SOLUTIONS (T-PLUS) ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #3

THURSDAY, JULY 08, 2004

4:00 P.M.

PLANNING COMMISSION CHAMBERS
MARIN CIVIC CENTER, ROOM 328
3501 Civic Center Drive
San Rafael, CA 94903

Committee Members Attending:

Evelyn Baker
Larry Chu
Phil Erickson
Alice Fredericks
Thomas Kronemeyer
Carey Lando
Trent Lethco
Nader Mansourian
Bob Pendoley
Steve Stein
Craig Thomas Yates

Members of the Public Attending:

Alan Nichol
Dwayne Hunn

1. Introductions

The meeting started at 4:15 p.m. Introductions were made. Phil Erickson reviewed the purpose and role of the Advisory Committee for the benefit of those who were not at the first meeting and for those new meeting attendees. Steve Stein asked that we find another meeting location to permit better discussion geography.

2. June 3, 2004 Meeting Minutes

Steve Stein indicated that there was a lot of good discussion at the last meeting that was not captured in the minutes. He asked that more detail be included in future minutes. The committee accepted the minutes with no changes.

3. Discussion on Draft Local TLC/HIP Program Guidelines

Trent Lethco summarized the Regional TLC/HIP Program Guidelines and clarified how the Local TLC/HIP must be consistent with MTC's requirements. He clarified that density and transit frequency criteria are not negotiable, but there are some exceptions applicable to the North Bay communities.

There were some things that were not defined in the proposed Program that need to be further clarified. Federal dollars must be spent on public right of ways and are not permitted to be spent on private property. Marin will receive \$323K per year for projects, based on population. The possibility of pooling the projects to meet the minimum while still keeping the application process open for housing projects to submit applications when they are ready may be a good option for Marin. Trent asked the committee whether a 2 or 3 year call for projects was preferred.

Pendoley indicated that he likes the idea of pooling money. Chu suggested a 2 or 3 year program. Stein felt that there was consensus at the last meeting that the committee agreed on a 3-year process. Rodriguez supports a multi-year process. It was noted that the main difference between 2- and 3-year process is the notification process of potential applicants.

Yates suggested putting laymen's terms in the application information that clearly outlines the types of projects that can and cannot be done with the funds.

The committee discussed the effect of having HIP funds awarded at anytime in the funding cycle on the overall cycle.

A committee member asked why the emphasis is on Capital and Housing and not Planning Grants? Lethco clarified that MTC funds planning studies that will lead to TLC/HIP projects, but the local funds would not fund planning grants. Yates asked whether it would be up to the planning commissions to do planning studies or is it up to TAM? Lethco clarified that housing projects are limited by many different timelines.

Mansourian explained that San Rafael is doing the same process for TDA projects, one of the important things in SR is that if they apply for planning funding for housing and transportation, they have to have a project to start with. He suggested that we tie it together to get funding.

Lethco suggested having a complimentary planning support process separate from this process. At the end of the three years, TAM awards remaining funds not spent on HIP to TLC Capital projects. Lethco asked the committee whether they wanted an open process. Rodriguez indicated that she liked the open process for HIP funds.

Evelyn Baker asked if we were moving forward with pooling funds, should there be a maximum cap on the project? Chu stated that the original intent was to pool funds, but asked whether there will be enough to fund larger projects? Lethco clarified that Marin wants to encourage housing and if one large project uses up all the funds, then that's ok. Stein is comfortable with this approach. Powell clarified that Barbara Collins supports the open application process for HIP funding.

There was a suggestion to create a diagram illustrating how the process works visually at the local level.

Pendoley asked if the requirements listed on Page 5 are mandates? Can we change any of these? Lethco clarified that yes, these are mandated and we cannot change these. Regarding the entitlement process requirement, Trent clarified that this is a good reason to have an open application process. This is a reason that local agencies are encouraged to keep the densities higher and can actually help prevent downzoning.

Lethco summarized that the sense of the committee was to do a rolling call for projects, a three year cycle, allow awarding remaining HIP funds on TLC Capital projects. He also noted that research shows that if you're under 20 units per acre, there won't be a mode shift. Stein asked that this kind of statement into the Toolkit because it helps put it in an understandable frame of reference.

The committee had extensive discussions on project minimums and maximums including, setting a cap for project funding, setting a cap for the amount of money each jurisdiction could be awarded, what kind of minimum project funding level for spending federal money, what happens when SR2S projects are smaller than \$500K. Lethco clarified that with SR2S projects, Caltrans allows them to submit funding requests for any amount. It was suggested that the project minimum be set at \$150K. However, it was noted that there is a lot of paperwork involved with Federal funds and in order to make it worth it to go through the process, we might want to require a higher minimum. There is an extraordinary administrative burden associated with Federal funding. Pendoley noted that the program is encouraging high-density housing and he felt that the \$150K minimum is ok.

Lethco clarified that funds must be spent within the proximity of the housing project and is further defined on Page 4, second paragraph. Stein noted that there is a conflict between the goal and the requirement. Some jurisdictions will be able to come up with a project that does meet the requirements and they should be the ones to get the money. We should make the criteria strict.

Lethco noted that Marin projects will be smaller scale and lower in density. It won't have much of an impact on small projects because the funding allocation will be so nominal. We should consider allowing the city to take the money and spend it in another area. Stein stated that MTC wants the county to award cities who meet the criteria. Lethco stated that smaller scale projects standing on their own might not be attractive to the city to apply for funds.

Chu asked whether funding to be used "in proximity" needs to have some kind of relationship or nexus to the project?

Pendoley described an affordable housing project in Corte Madera that would be really difficult to meet the suggested minimum \$150K. The minimum funding floor might be too high. Mansourian asked what the definition of "adjacent to transportation" is. He suggests sending an email to planning directors to ask what their plans are for the next 10 years. Lethco clarified that "adjacent to transportation" is defined in the criteria on Page 6 and that a Jitney service would not qualify for transportation service.

Erickson explained that they have mapped all transit data for Marin County but haven't identified potential housing sites. Might create a series of maps to send to jurisdictions to ask them to identify potential projects coming down the pipeline. We need more information on what the appropriate numbers are. Lethco indicated that the numbers are more of a test and that we might need to look at revising the funding minimum/maximum numbers in three years once we've had a chance to see whether it works for Marin or not.

Pendoley explained that it would take 83 bedrooms of extremely low income housing to reach the \$150K minimum. The sense of the committee is that the minimum funding level should be lowered. Staff suggested that we poll jurisdictions to see if they have a suggested funding level.

Lethco summarized the next steps: Develop scenarios, work flow chart, maps, and get feedback from local jurisdictions. Powell clarified that TAM director is advocating for \$500K minimum due to the significant administrative burden for claiming federal funds.

4. Discussion on Draft TOD/PeD Principles, Benefits, and Issues/Barriers

Phil Erickson thanked everyone for their comments on the draft documents.

When filling in the Issues and Barriers section, there was a lot of repetition. A new set of tables was created to group the four issue areas and provided a reference back to the relevant principles. This will replace the previous Issues/Barriers chart.

Taylor commented on Principle #1: she wants to see reliance on the automobile as a whole reduced, not just “single occupant vehicles”. Stein agrees with this, but would rather add language that clarifies that we want to “particularly reduce single-occupancy vehicles”. Powell indicated that TAM agrees with Stein’s suggestion. Stein wants to get some numbers to make people aware of the statistics. Valerie agrees with Stein’s suggestion. Mansourian agrees with the compromise language and noted that some project mitigations in San Rafael are to require carpooling.

It was clarified that the land use percentage splits were correct and the committee accepted them.

There were no comments on Principle 3.

Taylor commented on Principle # 4 and suggested further qualifying the phrase “quality housing”. Erickson clarified that it is meant to mean “high quality housing choices” and that in the principle, it may not be able to be defined, but it could be further defined elsewhere in the goals.

Chu asked whether the definition of housing was too broad? Is the strategy to move away from single-family detached homes, or should it be further defined so that it encourages other types of housing? He stated that we may want to encourage building more mixed use, higher density projects. Erickson asked where we should cut the line on the density issues? Chu indicated that housing density requirements almost excludes most housing projects in Marin by excluding a mix of housing types.

It was noted that the Toolkit would cover a broader area than the TLC/HIP program that doesn’t necessarily meet the HIP requirements. Chu explained that if we’re to encourage a certain type of development, and the toolkit is meant to encourage mixed use, then we almost want to have a broader range. Yates suggested that maybe a high-density structure would facilitate transit-oriented development.

Erickson asked that the committee brainstorm on how we want to encourage the types of housing in Marin. Stein noted that the importance of affordable housing as well as the importance of transit oriented development is such that we shouldn’t only focus on affordable

housing. Erickson asked what we mean by high quality. What density and are there particular household types that are underserved? Member of the public Hunn suggested that we cut "quality" out of housing and add the term "workforce housing," which will better explain the impediments to creating more affordable housing.

Does "workforce housing" term work in Marin or should we define "affordable housing" as that which houses our workforce? Erickson explained that we can't abandon references to affordable housing because of the state mandates. The sense of the committee was to work in the workforce housing term but still use "affordable". Yates noted that Below Market Rate (BMR) also applies to "workforce housing". There are BMR projects that are geared toward the workforce.

Powell suggested that we keep the term broad, acknowledge the affordability, but keep it to allow all types of housing projects. Taylor agreed with Powell and said that this is not an issue that we should try to cover comprehensively. Erickson suggested adding "high quality housing" and attempt to outline some examples of the variety of housing that should be encouraged. Then decide later whether it should stay in there or go into a separate discussion piece.

It was noted that transit oriented development is good in and of itself. A benefit is that affordable housing can be created with transit-oriented development. Trying to define or require affordable housing might weaken the primary message. The committee agrees with this.

Erickson asked committee members to submit further comments on the Issues and Barriers document to him by email. There is clearly a lot going on with a need for more information on the benefits and myths on transit oriented development and infill development. The Toolkit can provide information on why it makes sense to look at doing a different parking number and where to go to get answers to questions about this. There is a more immediate need in Marin to deal with the approvals process issues.

5. Public Comments

No additional comments from the public were received.

6. Confirm/Schedule Next Meeting Date and Time

The next regular meeting will be held on the first Thursday of August, which is August 5, 2004, from 4-6 p.m. The location will be determined.